

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

Claims 22 to 45 and 51 are pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 22 to 30, 39, 43, 44, and 51 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 22 to 30, 39, 43, 44, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,168 (“Geusic et al.”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,207,903 (“Wen et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, it is noted that the Final Office Action is inconsistent in that it maintains at page 4 that Wen et al. disclose vias at Figure 3b that include one of a right prism and a right cylinder, while indicating at page 14 that this feature would require a **modification** of the structure disclosed by Wen et al.

As regards the Final Office Action’s contentions at page 14, that “it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have a right prism, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a component,” Applicants respectfully disagree. In this regard, the feature of the feedthrough having one of a right prism and a right cylinder goes well beyond a “mere change in the shape of a component,” as it defines a relative arrangement of the sidewalls of the feedthrough and is of primary importance to the high-frequency properties of the feedthroughs. See, e.g., page 13, lines 6 to 9 of the Specification. It is further submitted that it would not be obvious to modify the vias of Wen et al. to be one of a right prism and a right cylinder because the pyramid geometry is **inherent** in the anisotropic etching process disclosed by Wen et al. See, e.g., col. 2, lines 57 to 62 and col. 3, lines 21 to 29.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 22. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not render unpatentable claim 22 or any of claims 23 to 30, 39, 43, 44, and 51, which ultimately depend from claim 22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 33 to 36 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 33 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,926,377 ("Nakao et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 33 to 36 ultimately depend from claim 22 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Nakao et al. are not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. Indeed, Nakao et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **IV. Rejection of Claims 37 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Nakao et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,312,765 ("Kanber"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Nakao et al., and Kanber does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 37 and 38 ultimately depend from claim 22 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Kanber is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al. Indeed, Kanber does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Nakao et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Nakao et al., and Kanber does not render unpatentable the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claim 45 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,901,050 ("Imai"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Imai does not render unpatentable claim 45 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 45 depends from claim 22 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Imai is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al. Indeed, Imai does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al. and Wen et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Imai does not render unpatentable claim 45. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**VI. Conclusion**

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 15, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/ Reg. No. 42,194 for:  
Gerard A. Messina  
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**